

Renormalizability and Phenomenology of θ -expanded Noncommutative Gauge Field Theory

Josip Trampetić^{1,*}

¹ Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia

Key words Noncommutativity, Enveloping algebra, Renormalization, Forbidden decays.

PACS 12.38.-t, 12.39.-x, 12.39.Dc, 14.20.-c, 12.60.Cn, 02.40.Gh, 11.10.Nx, 13.38.Dg

In this article we consider θ -expanded noncommutative gauge field theory, constructed at the first order in noncommutative parameter θ , as an effective, anomaly free theory, with one-loop renormalizable gauge sector. Related phenomenology with emphasis on the standard model forbidden decays, is discussed. Experimental possibilities of $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay are analyzed and a firm bound to the scale of the noncommutativity parameter is set around few TeV's.

1 Introduction

One of the first example of noncommutativity (NC) is well known Heisenberg algebra. Motivations to construct models on noncommutative space-time are coming from: String Theory, Quantum Gravity, Lorentz invariance breaking, and by its own right. The star product definition is as usual. The \star -commutator and Moyal-Weyl \star -product of two functions are:

$$[x^\mu, x^\nu]_\star = x^\mu \star x^\nu - x^\nu \star x^\mu = ih\theta^{\mu\nu}, \quad (f \star g)(x) = e^{-\frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}} f(x)g(y)|_{y \rightarrow x}. \quad (1)$$

Noncommutative space is flat Minkowski space where commutative coordinates x^μ are replaced by the NC ones \hat{x}^μ , satisfying the same commutator as above; that is:

$$x^\mu \rightarrow \hat{x}^\mu \Rightarrow [\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = ih\theta^{\mu\nu}, \quad [\theta^{\mu\nu}, \hat{x}^\rho] = 0. \quad (2)$$

Here θ is constant, antisymmetric and real 4×4 matrix; $h = 1/\Lambda_{\text{NC}}^2$ is noncommutative deformation parameter. Symmetry in our model [1], using Seiberg-Witten map (SW) [2] is extended to enveloping algebra [1, 3]. Any enveloping algebra based model is essentially double expansion in power series in θ [1, 3, 4, 5, 6]. In principle SW map express noncommutative functionals (parameters and functions of fields) spanned on the noncommutative space as a local functionals spanned on commutative space.

To obtain the action we first do the Seiberg-Witten expansion of NC fields in terms of commutative ones and second we expand the \star -product. This procedure generates tower of new vertices, however it is valid for any gauge group and arbitrary matter representation. Also there is no charge quantization problem and no UV/IR mixing [7]. Unitarity is satisfied for $\theta^{0i} = 0$ and $\theta^{ij} \neq 0$ [8, 9]; however careful canonical quantization produces always unitary theory. By covariant generalization of the condition $\theta^{0i} = 0$ to:

$$\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\nu} = -\theta^2 = 2h^2 \left(\sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^3 (\theta^{ij})^2 - \sum_{i=1}^3 (\theta^{0i})^2 \right) = \frac{2}{\Lambda_{\text{NC}}^4} (\vec{B}_\theta^2 - \vec{E}_\theta^2) > 0, \quad (3)$$

which is known as *perturbative unitarity condition* [10], there are no difficulties with unitarity in NC gauge theories. Finally covariant noncommutative Higgs and Yukawa couplings were possible to construct [4].

* Corresponding author E-mail: josipt@rex.irb.hr,

There are two essential points in which NC gauge field theory (NCGFT) differ from standard model (SM) gauge theories. The breakdown of Lorentz invariance with respect to a fixed nonzero background field $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ (which fixes preferred directions) and the appearance of new interactions and the modification of standard ones. For example, triple–neutral–gauge boson, two fermion–two gauge bosons, direct photon–neutrino couplings, etc. Both properties have a common origin and appear in a number of phenomena at very high energies and/or very short distances.

In this article we discuss θ -expanded theories, constructed as an effective, anomaly free [11] and one-loop renormalizable NCGFT [12, 13, 14, 15, 16], at the first order in noncommutative parameter θ . We also consider the 4ψ divergences in noncommutative chiral models for fermions; specifically we discuss the U(1) and the SU(2) cases [17]. Finally we discuss related phenomenology and determine the scale of noncommutativity Λ_{NC} , [18, 19, 20].

2 Properties of θ -expanded noncommutative gauge field theory

(a) Noncommutative gauge transformation:

Consider infinitesimal noncommutative local gauge transformation $\hat{\delta}$ of a fundamental matter field that carries a representation ρ_Ψ , which is in Abelian case fixed by the hypercharge,

$$\hat{\delta}\hat{\Psi} = i\rho_\Psi(\hat{\Lambda}) \star \hat{\Psi}. \quad (4)$$

(b) Covariant coordinates:

$$\hat{x}^\mu = x^\mu + h\theta^{\mu\nu}\hat{A}_\nu \quad (5)$$

were in noncommutative theory introduced in analogy to covariant derivatives in ordinary theory.

(c) Locality of the theory:

A \star -product of two ordinary functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, determined by a Poisson tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ and written in the form of expansion, is local function of f and g with finite number of derivatives at each order in θ :

$$f(x) \star g(x) = f(x) \cdot g(x) + \frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu f(x) \cdot \partial_\nu g(x) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2). \quad (6)$$

(d) Gauge equivalence, and consistency conditions for the theory:

Ordinary gauge transformations $\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \Lambda + i[\Lambda, A_\mu]$ and $\delta \Psi = i\Lambda \cdot \Psi$ induce noncommutative gauge transformations of the fields $\hat{A}, \hat{\Psi}$ with gauge parameter $\hat{\Lambda}$

$$\delta \hat{A}_\mu = \hat{\delta} \hat{A}_\mu \quad \delta \hat{\Psi} = \hat{\delta} \hat{\Psi}. \quad (7)$$

Consistency require that any pair of noncommutative gauge parameters $\hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\Lambda}'$ satisfy

$$[\hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\Lambda}'] + i\delta_{\hat{\Lambda}} \hat{\Lambda}' - i\delta_{\hat{\Lambda}'} \hat{\Lambda} = [\hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\Lambda}']. \quad (8)$$

(e) Enveloping algebra-valued noncommutative gauge parameters and fields:

For the enveloping algebra-valued gauge transformation, the commutator

$$[\hat{\Lambda}, \hat{\Lambda}'] = \frac{1}{2}\{\Lambda_a(x) \star \Lambda'_b(x)\}[T^a, T^b] + \frac{1}{2}[\Lambda_a(x) \star \Lambda'_b(x)]\{T^a, T^b\} \quad (9)$$

of two Lie algebra-valued noncommutative gauge parameters $\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda_a(x)T^a$ and $\hat{\Lambda}' = \Lambda'_a(x)T^a$ does not close in Lie. For noncommutative SU(N) the Lie algebra traceless condition is incompatible with commutator. So, for noncommutative gauge transformation we have extension to the enveloping algebra-valued gauge transformation expressed by the following expansion:

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \Lambda_a^0(x)T^a + \Lambda_{ab}^1(x) : T^a T^b : + \Lambda_{abc}^2(x) : T^a T^b T^c : + \dots \quad (10)$$

(f) Seiberg-Witten map:

Closing condition for gauge transformation algebra are homogenous differential equations, which are solved by iteration, order by order in noncommutative parameter θ . Solutions are known as Seiberg-Witten map. Hermiticity condition for the fields, up to the first order in Seiberg-Witten expansion, gives for gauge parameter, fermion and gauge fields the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Lambda} &= \Lambda + \frac{h}{4}\theta^{\mu\nu}\{V_\nu, \partial_\mu\Lambda\} + \dots & \hat{\psi} &= \psi - \frac{h}{2}\theta^{\alpha\beta}\left(V_\alpha\partial_\beta - \frac{i}{4}[V_\alpha, V_\beta]\right)\psi + \dots \\ \hat{V}_\mu &= V_\mu + \frac{h}{4}\theta^{\alpha\beta}\{\partial_\alpha V_\mu + F_{\alpha\mu}, V_\beta\} + \dots \\ \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu\hat{V}_\nu - \partial_\nu\hat{V}_\mu - i[\hat{V}_\mu, \hat{V}_\nu] = F_{\mu\nu} + \frac{h}{4}\theta^{\rho\sigma}\left(2\{F_{\rho\mu}, F_{\sigma\nu}\} - \{V_\rho, (\partial_\sigma + D_\sigma)F_{\mu\nu}\}\right).\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

3 Noncommutative gauge field theory framework proposal

Commutative GFT, that are renormalizable with minimal coupling, are extended in the same minimal fashion to the NC space with deformed gauge transformations. These deformations are not unique. For instance deformed action S_g depends on the choice of representation. This derives from the fact that $\hat{F}^{\mu\nu}$ is enveloping algebra not Lee algebra valued. So called ‘minimally coupled NC’ gauge-invariant action is:

$$S_{\text{NC}} = S_g + S_\psi = -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr} \int d^4x \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \star \hat{F}^{\mu\nu} + i \int d^4x \hat{\bar{\varphi}} \star \bar{\sigma}^\mu (\partial_\mu + i\hat{A}_\mu) \star \hat{\varphi}. \quad (12)$$

The trace Tr in S_g is over all representations. $\hat{\varphi}$ ’s are the noncommutative Weyl spinors. Applying Seiberg-Witten map on the above action up to first order in θ we obtain ‘minimal’ actions

$$\begin{aligned}S_g &= -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr} \int d^4x F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + h\theta^{\rho\sigma}\text{Tr} \int d^4x \left[\left(\frac{1}{4}F_{\rho\sigma}F_{\mu\nu} - F_{\rho\mu}F_{\sigma\nu} \right) F^{\mu\nu} \right], \\ S_\psi &= i \int d^4x \bar{\varphi}\sigma^\mu(\partial_\mu + iA_\mu)\varphi - \frac{h}{8}\theta^{\mu\nu}\Delta_{\mu\nu\rho}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \int d^4x F_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\varphi} \bar{\sigma}^\rho (\partial_\gamma + iA_\gamma)\varphi, \\ \Delta_{\mu\nu\rho}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} &= \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\lambda}\varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho}.\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

Clearly we do not know the meaning of ‘minimal coupling concept’ for some NCGFT in the NC space. However, renormalization is the principle that help us to find such acceptable couplings. We learned that the renormalizability condition of some specific NCGFT requires introduction of the higher order noncommutative gauge interaction by expanding general NC action in terms of NC field strengths. This of course extends ‘NC minimal coupling’ of the gauge action S_g in (12) to higher order:

$$S_g = -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr} \int d^4x \left(1 - \frac{a-1}{2}h\theta_{\rho\sigma} \star \hat{F}^{\rho\sigma} \right) \star \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \star \hat{F}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (14)$$

with a being free parameter determining renormalizable deformation. This was possible due to the symmetry property of an object $\theta_{\rho\sigma} \star \hat{F}^{\rho\sigma}$. SW map for NC field strength up to the first order in $h\theta^{\mu\nu}$ than gives:

$$S_g = \text{Tr} \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + h\theta^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{a}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma} - F_{\mu\rho}F_{\nu\sigma} \right) F^{\rho\sigma} \right]. \quad (15)$$

In the chiral fermion sector the choice of Majorana spinors for the U(1) case gives

$$S_\psi = \frac{i}{2} \int d^4x \left[\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(\partial_\mu - i\gamma_5 A_\mu)\psi + i\frac{h}{8}\theta^{\mu\nu}\Delta_{\mu\nu\rho}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} F_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\psi} \gamma^\rho (\partial_\gamma - i\gamma_5 A_\gamma)\psi \right]. \quad (16)$$

For the SU(2) case relevant expressions are given in [17].

Proposed framework gives starting action for the gauge and fermion sectors. Requirement of renormalizability fixes the freedom parameter a . That is, the principle of renormalization determines NC renormalizable deformation. Trace of three generators in the above action lead to dependence of the gauge group representation and the choice of the trace corresponds to the choice of the group representation.

4 Gauge sector

4.1 Gauge sector of minimal NCSM

Choosing vector field in the adjoint representation, i.e. using a sum of three traces over the standard model gauge group we have the following action

$$S_g^{\text{mNCSM}} = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \left(\frac{1}{g'^2} \text{Tr}_1 + \frac{1}{g^2} \text{Tr}_2 + \frac{1}{g_s^2} \text{Tr}_3 \right) \left(1 - \frac{a-1}{2} h \theta_{\rho\sigma} \star \hat{F}^{\rho\sigma} \right) \star \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \star \hat{F}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (17)$$

In definition of Tr_1 we use usual representation of the hypercharge $Y = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$. For the fundamental representations of SU(2) and SU(3) we have the generators in Tr_2 and Tr_3 , respectively. In terms of physical fields, the gauge action then reads

$$\begin{aligned} S_g^{\text{mNCSM}} = & -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{A}^{\mu\nu} + \text{Tr} \mathcal{B}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu} + \text{Tr} G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} g_s d^{abc} h \theta^{\rho\sigma} \left(\frac{a}{4} G_{\rho\sigma}^a G_{\mu\nu}^b - G_{\rho\mu}^a G_{\sigma\nu}^b \right) G^{\mu\nu,c} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where d^{abc} are totally symmetric SU(3) group coefficients which come from the trace in (17). The $\mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{B}_{\mu\nu} (= B_{\mu\nu}^a T_L^a)$ and $G_{\mu\nu} (= G_{\mu\nu}^a T_S^a)$ denote the U(1), SU(2)_L and SU(3)_c field strengths, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \mathcal{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}_\mu, \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu B_\nu^a - \partial_\nu B_\mu^a + g \epsilon^{abc} B_\mu^b B_\nu^c, \\ G_{\mu\nu}^a &= \partial_\mu G_\nu^a - \partial_\nu G_\mu^a + g_s f^{abc} G_\mu^b G_\nu^c. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For adjoint representation there is no new neutral electroweak triple gauge boson interactions.

4.2 Gauge sector of nonminimal NCSM

The nmNCSM gauge sector action is given by Eq.(15) where Tr is trace over all massive particle multiplets with different quantum numbers in the model that have covariant derivative acting on them; five multiplets for each generation of fermions and one Higgs multiplet. Here $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu V_\nu - \partial_\nu V_\mu - i[V_\mu, V_\nu]$ is standard model field strength, i.e. V_μ is the standard model gauge potential:

$$V^\mu = g' \mathcal{A}^\mu(x) Y + g \sum_{a=1}^3 B_a^\mu(x) T_L^a + g_s \sum_{b=1}^8 G_b^\mu(x) T_S^b. \quad (20)$$

Matching the standard model action at zeroth order in θ , three consistency conditions are imposed producing final expression for triple gauge boson (TGB) action. In terms of the U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) field strengths, $f_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}^a$ and $G_{\mu\nu}^b$, respectively, we have the following action

$$\begin{aligned} S_{gauge}^{\text{nmNCSM}} = & S_{cl} = -\frac{1}{4} \int d^4x f_{\mu\nu} f^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}) \\ & + g'^2 \kappa_1 h \theta^{\rho\tau} \int d^4x \left(\frac{a}{4} f_{\rho\tau} f_{\mu\nu} - f_{\mu\rho} f_{\nu\tau} \right) f^{\mu\nu} \\ & + g' g^2 \kappa_2 h \theta^{\rho\tau} \int d^4x \sum_{a=1}^3 \left[\left(\frac{a}{4} f_{\rho\tau} B_{\mu\nu}^a - f_{\mu\rho} B_{\nu\tau}^a \right) B^{\mu\nu,a} + c.p. \right] \\ & + g' g_s^2 \kappa_3 h \theta^{\rho\tau} \int d^4x \sum_{b=1}^8 \left[\left(\frac{a}{4} f_{\rho\tau} G_{\mu\nu}^b - f_{\mu\rho} G_{\nu\tau}^b \right) G^{\mu\nu,b} + c.p. \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Three consistency conditions together with definitions of three couplings κ_i and the requirement that $1/g_i^2 > 0$ define a 3D pentahedron in the six-dimensional moduli space spanned by $1/g_1^2, \dots, 1/g_6^2$. See details in [6]. The interactions Lagrangian's in terms of physical fields and effective couplings are [6]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\gamma\gamma\gamma}^\theta = \frac{e}{4} \sin 2\theta_W K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} h\theta^{\rho\tau} A^{\mu\nu} (aA_{\mu\nu}A_{\rho\tau} - 4A_{\mu\rho}A_{\nu\tau}) , \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Z\gamma\gamma}^\theta &= \frac{e}{4} \sin 2\theta_W K_{Z\gamma\gamma} h\theta^{\rho\tau} [2Z^{\mu\nu} (2A_{\mu\rho}A_{\nu\tau} - aA_{\mu\nu}A_{\rho\tau}) \\ &\quad + 8Z_{\mu\rho}A^{\mu\nu}A_{\nu\tau} - aZ_{\rho\tau}A_{\mu\nu}A^{\mu\nu}] , \quad \text{ect.}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} gg'(\kappa_1 + 3\kappa_2) , \quad K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} [g'^2\kappa_1 + (g'^2 - 2g^2)\kappa_2] , \quad \text{ect.} \quad (24)$$

5 Renormalization

One-loop renormalization is performed by using the background field method (BFM) [21, 22]. Advantage of the BFM is the guarantee of covariance, because by doing the path integral the local symmetry of the quantum field Φ_V is fixed, while the gauge symmetry of the background field ϕ_V is manifestly preserved. Quantization is performed by the functional integration over the quantum vector field Φ_V in the saddle-point approximation around classical (background) configuration. For case $\phi_V = \text{constant}$, the main contribution to the functional integral is given by the Gaussian integral. Split the vector potential into the classical background plus the quantum-fluctuation parts, that is: We replace, $\phi_V \rightarrow \phi_V + \Phi_V$, and then compute the terms quadratic in the quantum fields. Interactions are of the polynomial type.

Proper quantization requires the presence of the gauge fixing term $S_{\text{gf}}[\phi]$. Adding to the SM part in the usual way, Feynman-Faddeev-Popov ghost appears in the effective action. Result of functional integration

$$\Gamma[\phi] = S_{\text{cl}}[\phi] + S_{\text{gf}}[\phi] + \Gamma^{(1)}[\phi] , \quad S_{\text{gf}}[\phi] = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (D_\mu \Phi_V^\mu)^2 , \quad (25)$$

produce the standard result of the commutative part of our action. The one-loop effective part $\Gamma^{(1)}[\phi]$ is given by

$$\Gamma^{(1)}[\phi] = \frac{i}{2} \log \det S^{(2)}[\phi] = \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \log S^{(2)}[\phi] , \quad (26)$$

where $S^{(2)}[\phi]$ is the second functional derivative of a classical action.

The one-loop effective action computed by using background field method gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\theta,2}^{(1)} &= \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \log (\mathcal{I} + \square^{-1}(N_1 + N_2 + T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4)) \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \text{Tr} (\square^{-1}N_1 + \square^{-1}N_2 + \square^{-1}T_1 + \square^{-1}T_2 + \square^{-1}T_3 + \square^{-1}T_4)^n , \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where N_i are commutative and T_i noncommutative vertices, respectively [13, 14, 15, 17, 27].

5.1 Renormalization of nmNCSM

Divergent contributions for this model comes from combinations of N_1 , N_2 and T_1 , T_2 vertices. Divergences for $U(1)_Y - SU(2)_C$ and $U(1)_Y - SU(3)_C$ mixed noncommutative terms, from (21), are

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{div}}^{(1)} &= \frac{11}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon} \int d^4x B_{\mu\nu}^i B^{\mu\nu i} + \frac{11}{2(4\pi)^2\epsilon} \int d^4x G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{\mu\nu a} \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon} g' g^2 \kappa_2 (3-a) h\theta^{\mu\nu} \int d^4x \left(\frac{1}{4} f_{\mu\nu} B_{\rho\sigma}^i B^{\rho\sigma i} - f_{\mu\rho} B_{\nu\sigma}^i B^{\rho\sigma i} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{6}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon} g' g_S^2 \kappa_3 (3-a) h\theta^{\mu\nu} \int d^4x \left(\frac{1}{4} f_{\mu\nu} G_{\rho\sigma}^a G^{\rho\sigma a} - f_{\mu\rho} G_{\nu\sigma}^a G^{\rho\sigma a} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Renormalization is obtained via counter-terms and for the obvious choice $a = 3$, giving bare Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_{ct} = & -\frac{1}{4}f_{0\mu\nu}f_0^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}B_{0\mu\nu}^i B_0^{\mu\nu i} - \frac{1}{4}G_{0\mu\nu}^a G_0^{\mu\nu a} \\
& + g'^3 \kappa_1 h \theta^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{3}{4}f_{0\mu\nu}f_{0\rho\sigma}f_0^{\rho\sigma} - f_{0\mu\rho}f_{0\nu\sigma}f_0^{\rho\sigma} \right) \\
& + g'_0 g_0^2 \kappa_2 h \theta^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{3}{4}f_{0\mu\nu}B_{0\rho\sigma}^i B_0^{\rho\sigma i} - f_{0\mu\rho}B_{0\nu\sigma}^i B_0^{\rho\sigma i} + c.p. \right) \\
& + g'_0 (g_S)_0^2 \kappa_3 h \theta^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{3}{4}f_{0\mu\nu}G_{0\rho\sigma}^a G_0^{\rho\sigma a} - f_{0\mu\rho}G_{0\nu\sigma}^a G_0^{\rho\sigma a} + c.p. \right). \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expression the bare quantities are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_0^\mu &= \mathcal{A}^\mu, \quad g'_0 = g', \\
B_0^{\mu i} &= B^{\mu i} \sqrt{1 + \frac{44g^2}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}, \quad g_0 = \frac{g\mu^{\epsilon/2}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{44g^2}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}}, \\
G_0^{\mu a} &= G^{\mu a} \sqrt{1 + \frac{22g_S^2}{(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}, \quad (g_S)_0 = \frac{g_S\mu^{\epsilon/2}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{22g_S^2}{(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}}. \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Constants κ_1 , κ_2 and κ_3 remain unchanged under renormalization

$$\kappa_1 = (\kappa_1)_0, \quad \kappa_2 = (\kappa_2)_0, \quad \kappa_3 = (\kappa_3)_0, \quad (31)$$

if the following replacement in $1/g_i^2$ couplings were applied:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{g_1^2} &= \left(\frac{1}{g_1^2}\right)_0 + \frac{33}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}, \quad \frac{1}{g_2^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g_2^2}\right)_0 + \frac{-11}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}, \quad \frac{1}{g_3^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g_3^2}\right)_0 + \frac{-11}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}, \\
\frac{1}{g_4^2} &= \left(\frac{1}{g_4^2}\right)_0 + \frac{-143}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}, \quad \frac{1}{g_5^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g_5^2}\right)_0 + \frac{-121}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}, \quad \frac{1}{g_6^2} = \left(\frac{1}{g_6^2}\right)_0 + \frac{110}{18(4\pi)^2\epsilon}. \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

Since, for $a = 3$, our Lagrangian is free from divergences at one-loop noncommutative deformation parameter h need not be renormalized.

5.2 Renormalization of noncommutative SU(N) gauge theory and mNCSM gauge sector

Choosing vector field in the adjoint representation SU(N) we have the following Lagrangian

$$S_{cl} = S_{\text{NCYM}} = \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4}h\theta^{\mu\nu} d^{abc} \left(\frac{a}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^b - F_{\mu\rho}^a F_{\nu\sigma}^b \right) F^{c\rho\sigma} \right), \quad (33)$$

where d^{abc} are totally symmetric coefficients of the SU(N) group which come from the trace in (15); $a, b, c = 1, \dots, N^2 - 1$ are the group indices. Divergent contributions for the model, computed by using BFM, comes from combinations of N_1 , N_2 and T_2 , T_3 , T_4 vertices. Renormalization of the theory is obtained by canceling divergences. To have that the counter terms should be added to the starting action, which than produces the bare Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0 &= -\frac{1}{4}F_{0\mu\nu}^a F_0^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4}g\mu^{\epsilon/2}h\theta^{\mu\nu}d^{abc} \\
&\times \left[\frac{a}{4} \left(1 - \frac{3-25a}{3a} \frac{Ng^2}{(4\pi)^2\epsilon} \right) F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^b - \left(1 + \frac{21+a}{3} \frac{Ng^2}{(4\pi)^2\epsilon} \right) F_{\mu\rho}^a F_{\nu\sigma}^b \right] F^{c\rho\sigma}. \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

To reach the same structure as in starting Lagrangian we have to impose the condition

$$\left(-\frac{25a-3}{48}\right) : \left(\frac{a+21}{12}\right) = \frac{a}{4} : (-1), \quad (35)$$

which has two solutions: $a = 1$ and $a = 3$ [15].

The case $a = 1$ corresponds to previous result [13] and the deformation parameter h need not to be renormalized. Renormalizability is, in this case, obtained through the known renormalization of gauge fields and coupling constant only.

However the case $a = 3$ is different since additional divergences can be absorbed only into the non-commutative deformation parameter h . That is that h has to be renormalized. The bare gauge field, the coupling constant and the noncommutative deformation parameter are [15]:

$$V_0^\mu = V^\mu \sqrt{1 + \frac{22Ng^2}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}, \quad g_0 = \frac{g\mu^{\epsilon/2}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{22Ng^2}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}}, \quad h_0 = \frac{h}{1 - \frac{2Ng^2}{3(4\pi)^2\epsilon}}. \quad (36)$$

The necessity of the h renormalization jeopardizes previous hope that the NC SU(N) gauge theory might be renormalizable to all orders in $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. Above results are also valid for the minimal NCSM gauge sector (18) with $N = 3$.

5.3 Ultraviolet asymptotic behavior of noncommutative SU(N) gauge theory

Gauge coupling constant g in our theory depends on energy i.e., the renormalization point μ , satisfying the same beta function as in QCD

$$\beta_g = \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g(\mu) = -\frac{11Ng^3(\mu)}{3(4\pi)^2} \Rightarrow \alpha_s(\mu) = \frac{g^2(\mu)}{4\pi} = \frac{6\pi}{11N} \frac{1}{\ln \frac{\mu}{\Lambda}}, \quad (37)$$

our theory is UV stable, i.e. asymptotically free. In (37) Λ is an integration constant determined from experiment: hadronic production in e^+e^- annihilation at the Z resonance has given $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.12$ corresponding to $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \simeq 250$ MeV. Next, from (36) and (37) we have

$$\beta_h = \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} h(\mu) = -\frac{11Ng^2(\mu)}{24\pi^2} h(\mu) \Rightarrow h(\mu) = \frac{h_0}{\ln \frac{\mu}{\Lambda}}. \quad (38)$$

Both β functions are negative that is it decrease with increasing energy μ [15]. Solution to β_h shows that by increase of energy μ the the NC deformation parameter h decreases. The NC deformation parameter h becomes the running deformation parameter and vanishes for large μ [15]. From this follows necessity of the modification of Heisenberg uncertainty relations at high energy. String theory inspired modification

$$[x, p] = i\hbar(1 + \beta p^2) \Rightarrow \Delta x = \frac{\hbar}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta p} + \beta \Delta p \right). \quad (39)$$

show that for large momenta Δp (energy) distance Δx grows linearly. So large energies do not necessarily correspond to small distances, and running h does not imply that noncommutativity vanishes at small distances. This is related to UV/IR correspondence. From Eq. (38) and $h = 1/\Lambda_{\text{NC}}$ we have

$$h(\mu) = \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\text{NC}}^2(\mu)} \Rightarrow \Lambda_{\text{NC}}(\mu) = \Lambda_{\text{NC}} \sqrt{\ln \frac{\mu}{\Lambda}}, \quad (40)$$

i.e. Λ_{NC} becomes a function of energy μ . This way, via RGE, the scale of noncommutativity Λ_{NC} becomes the running scale of non-commutativity too [15]. However it receives very is small change when energy μ increases. This means that there is a large degree of stability of NC SU(N) theory within a wide range of energies. For example, considering typical QCD energies, $\mu = m_Z$, factor $\sqrt{\ln(m_Z/\Lambda_{\text{QCD}})} \simeq 2.4$.

5.4 The 4ψ divergences for noncommutative chiral fermions in U(1) and SU(2) cases

The one-loop effective action is computed from Eq. (16) by using background field method

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\theta,2}^{(1)} &= \frac{i}{2} \text{STr} \log (\mathcal{I} + \square^{-1} (N_1 + N_2 + T_1 + T_2 + T_3)) \\ &= \frac{i}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} \text{STr} (\square^{-1} N_1 + \square^{-1} T_1 + \square^{-1} T_2)^n .\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

Divergent contributions comes from

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \text{STr} ((\square^{-1} N_1)^3 (\square^{-1} T_1)) , \quad \mathcal{D}_2 = \text{STr} ((\square^{-1} N_1)^2 (\square^{-1} T_2)) . \quad (42)$$

Our computations shows that term \mathcal{D}_1 is finite due to the structure of the momentum integrals in both, the U(1) and the SU(2), cases. For NC chiral electrodynamics, U(1), with Majorana spinors and with the usual definition for the supertrace STr , [27], we have found

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{U}(1)}|_{\text{div}} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2 \epsilon} \frac{3i}{8} h \theta^{\mu\nu} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\bar{\psi} \gamma^\rho \gamma_5 \psi) (\bar{\psi} \gamma^\sigma \gamma_5 \psi) \equiv 0 . \quad (43)$$

Next we have used chiral fermions in the fundamental representation of SU(2). Choosing Majorana spinors we apparently break the SU(2) symmetry, and consequently we have to work in the framework of the components for the vector potential. Now of course, Majorana $\begin{pmatrix} \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 \end{pmatrix}$ is not a SU(2) doublet. Divergent part of \mathcal{D}_2 is

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{\text{SU}(2)}|_{\text{div}} = \frac{-1}{(4\pi)^2 \epsilon} \frac{9i}{64} h \theta^{\mu\nu} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\rho \gamma_5 \psi_1 + \bar{\psi}_2 \gamma^\rho \gamma_5 \psi_2) (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\sigma \gamma_5 \psi_1 + \bar{\psi}_2 \gamma^\sigma \gamma_5 \psi_2), \quad (44)$$

and it vanishes identically, too.

Clearly, we may conclude that direct computations by using BFM confirms results of the symmetry analysis for the 4ψ divergent term, which, due to its SU(2) invariance, has to be zero [17]. The same symmetry arguments holds also for U(1) and SU(2) \mathcal{D}_1 terms, i.e. they both vanish identically too.

6 Forbidden decays $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, gg$

From the gauge-invariant amplitude for $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, gg$ decays in momentum space and for Z boson at rest we have found the following branching ratios. For $a = 3$, we have

$$BR(Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \tau_Z \frac{\alpha}{4} \frac{M_Z^5}{\Lambda_{\text{NC}}^4} \sin^2 2\theta_W K_{Z\gamma\gamma}^2 (\vec{E}_\theta^2 + \vec{B}_\theta^2) = \frac{1}{8} \frac{K_{Z\gamma\gamma}^2}{K_{Zgg}^2} BR(Z \rightarrow gg), \quad (45)$$

where τ_Z is the Z boson lifetime. LHC experimental possibilities for $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ we analyze by using the CMS Physics Technical Design Report [23, 24]. We have found that for 10^7 events of $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ for 10 fb^{-1} in 2 years of LHC running and by assuming $BR(Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \sim 10^{-8}$ and using $BR(Z \rightarrow e^+e^-) = 0.03$ about ~ 3 events of $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays should be found. However, note that background sources (CMS Note 2006/112, Fig.3) could potentially be a big problem. For example study for $Higgs \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ shows that, when e^- from $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$ radiates very high energy Bremsstrahlung photon into pixel detector, for similar energies of e^- and γ , there is a huge probability of misidentification of e^- with γ . Second, the irreducible di-photon background may also kill the signal. The $Z \rightarrow gg$ decay was discussed in [6].

Finally, note that after 10 years of LHC running integrated luminosity would reach $\sim 1000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$. In that case and from bona fide reasonable assumption $BR(Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \sim 10^{-8}$ one would find 300 events of $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays, or one would have ~ 3 events with $BR(Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \sim 10^{-10}$. From above it follows that, in the later case, the lower bound on the scale of noncommutativity would be $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 1 \text{ TeV}$.

7 Limits on the noncommutativity scale Λ_{NC}

Limits on the scale of noncommutativity in high energy particle physics are coming from the analysis of decay and scattering experiments.

Considering SM forbidden decays, recently we have found the following lower limit $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 1 \text{ TeV}$ [18] from $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay. Note here that earlier limits obtained from $\gamma_{\text{pl}} \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ decay (astrophysics analysis) produces $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 81 \text{ GeV}$ [19] while from the SM forbidden $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $K \rightarrow \pi\gamma$ [20] decays we obtain $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 9 \text{ GeV}$, and $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 43 \text{ GeV}$, respectively. Last two bounds are not useful due to the too high lower limit of the relevant branching ratios.

Scattering experiments [25] support the above obtained limits. From annihilation $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \bar{f}f$ it was found $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 200 \text{ GeV}$, which is a bit too low. However, from $\bar{f}f \rightarrow Z\gamma$ unelastic scattering experiments there is very interesting limit $\Lambda_{\text{NC}} > 1 \text{ TeV}$.

8 Summary and Conclusion

Principle of renormalizability implemented on our θ -expanded NCGFT led us to well defined deformation via introduction of higher order noncommutative action class for the gauge sectors of the mNCSM, nmNCSM and NC SU(N) models. This extension was parametrized by generically free parameter a :

$$S_g = -\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr} \int d^4x \left(1 + i(a-1) \hat{x}_\rho \star \hat{x}_\sigma \star \hat{F}^{\rho\sigma} \right) \star \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \star \hat{F}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (46)$$

We have found the following properties of the above models with respect to renormalization procedure:

- ★ Renormalization principle is fixing the freedom parameter a for our θ -expanded NC GFT.
- ★ Divergences cancel differently than in commutative GFT and this depends on the representations.
- ★ Gauge sector of the mNCSM is renormalizable for $a = 1$. Divergences were absorbed through the coupling and fields redefinition only, like in the SM. Consequently, no renormalization of the noncommutative deformation parameter h is necessary.
- ★ Gauge sector of the nmNCSM, which produces SM forbidden $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay, is renormalizable and **finite** for $a = 3$. Due to this finiteness no renormalization of h necessary.
- ★ Noncommutative SU(N) gauge theory is renormalizable for $a = 1$ and $a = 3$. The case $a = 1$ corresponds to the earlier obtained result [13]. However, in the case $a = 3$ additional divergences appear and had to be absorbed through the renormalization of the noncommutative deformation h . Hence, in the case of noncommutative SU(N) the noncommutativity deformation parameter h had to be renormalized and it is **asymptotically free**, opposite to the previous expectations.
- ★ The solution $a = 3$, while shifting the model to the higher order, i.e. while extending ‘NC minimal coupling’, hints into the discovery of the key role of the higher noncommutative gauge interaction in one-loop renormalizability of classes of NCGFT at the first order in θ .
- ★ Our computations also confirm symmetry arguments that for noncommutative chiral electrodynamics, that is the U(1) case with Majorana spinors, the 4ψ divergent part vanishes. For noncommutative chiral fermions in the fundamental representation of SU(2) with Majorana spinors the 4ψ divergent part vanishes due to the SU(2) invariance. So, for noncommutative U(1) and SU(2) chiral fermion models typical 4ψ -divergence is **absent**, contrary to the earlier results obtained for Dirac fermions [26, 27].
- ★ There is similarity to noncommutative ϕ^4 theory. Namely, by adding $\Omega \int d^4x \hat{x} \star \hat{x} \star \hat{\phi} \star \hat{\phi}$ term to the ‘minimal’ action, the noncommutative ϕ^4 theory becomes renormalizable up to all orders [28]. This way renormalization principle determines noncommutative renormalizable deformation up to all orders.
- ★ Note also that the renormalizability principle could help to minimize or even cancel most of the ambiguities of the higher order Seiberg-Witten maps [29].
- ★ Finally, phenomenological results, as the standard model forbidden $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay, are **robust** due to the one-loop renormalizability and **finiteness** of the nmNCSM gauge sector [14, 18].

Acknowledgements Part of this work was done during my visit to ESI, Vienna and MPI, München. I would like to use this opportunity to acknowledge H. Grosse at ESI, and W. Hollik at MPI, for hospitality and support. This work is supported by the project 098-0982930-2900 of the Croatian Ministry of Science Education and Sports and by the European Community's Marie-Curie Research Training Network under contract MRTN-CT-2006-035505 'Tools and PrecisionCalculations for Physics Discoveries at Colliders' (HEPTOOLS).

References

- [1] J. Madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C16** (2000) 161 [arXiv:hep-th/0001203]; B. Jurčo, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C17** (2000) 521 [arXiv:hep-th/0006246]; B. Jurčo, L. Möller, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C21** (2001) 383 [arXiv:hep-th/0104153].
- [2] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP **09** (1999) 032 [arXiv:hep-th/9908142].
- [3] X. Calmet, B. Jurčo, P. Schupp, J. Wess and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C23** (2002) 363 [arXiv:hep-ph/0111115].
- [4] B. Melic, K. Pasek-Kumericki, J. Trampetić, P. Schupp and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C 42** (2005) 483 [arXiv:hep-ph/0502249]; *ibid* 499 [arXiv:hep-ph/0503064].
- [5] P. Aschieri, B. Jurčo, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. **B651** (2003) 45 [arXiv:hep-th/0205214].
- [6] W. Behr, N.G. Deshpande, G. Duplancić, P. Schupp, J. Trampetić and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C29** (2003) 441 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202121]; G. Duplancić, P. Schupp and J. Trampetić, Eur. Phys. J. **C32** (2003) 141 [arXiv:hep-ph/0309138].
- [7] I. Chepelev and R. Roiban, JHEP **0005** (2000) 037 [arXiv:hep-th/9911098]; I. Y. Aref'eva, D. M. Belov and A. S. Koshelev, Phys. Lett. B **476** (2000) 431 [arXiv:hep-th/9912075]; C. P. Martin and D. Sanchez-Ruiz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 476 [arXiv:hep-th/9903077]; S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0002** (2000) 020 [arXiv:hep-th/9912072]; A. Matusis, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, JHEP **0012** (2000) 002 [arXiv:hep-th/0002075].
- [8] N. Seiberg, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, JHEP **0006**, 044 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0005015].
- [9] J. Gomis and T. Mehen, Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 265 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0005129].
- [10] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane and T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105082].
- [11] F. Brandt, C.P. Martin and F. Ruiz Ruiz, JHEP **07** (2003) 068 [arXiv:hep-th/0307292].
- [12] A. Bichl, J. Grimstrup, H. Grosse, L. Popp, M. Schweda and R. Wulkenhaar, JHEP **06** (2001) 013 [arXiv:hep-th/0104097].
- [13] M. Buric, D. Latas and V. Radovanovic, JHEP **0602** (2006) 046 [arXiv:hep-th/0510133];
- [14] M. Buric, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetić, JHEP **03** (2007) 030 [arXiv:hep-th/0609073]. V. Radovanovic, M. Buric and J. Trampetić, SFIN A **1** (2007) 159 [arXiv:0711.2788 [hep-th]].
- [15] D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetić, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 085006, arXiv:hep-th/0703018.
- [16] C. P. Martin, D. Sanchez-Ruiz and C. Tamarit, JHEP **0702** (2007) 065 [arXiv:hep-th/0612188].
- [17] M. Buric, D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetić, arXiv:0711.0887 [hep-th].
- [18] M. Buric, D. Latas, V. Radovanovic and J. Trampetić, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 097701 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611299].
- [19] J. Trampetić, Acta Phys. Polon. B **33** (2002) 4317 [hep-ph/0212309]; P. Schupp and J. Trampetić, Springer Proc. Phys. **98** (2005) 219 [arXiv:hep-ph/0405163]; P. Schupp, J. Trampetić, J. Wess and G. Raffelt, Eur. Phys. J. C **36** (2004) 405 [arXiv:hep-ph/0212292]. P. Minkowski, P. Schupp and J. Trampetić, Eur. Phys. J. C **37** (2004) 123 [arXiv:hep-th/0302175]; J. Trampetić, SFIN A **1** (2007) 379 arXiv:0704.0559 [hep-ph].
- [20] B. Melic, K. Pasek-Kumericki and J. Trampetić, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 054004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0503133]; *ibid* 057502 [arXiv:hep-ph/0507231].
- [21] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **62** (1973) 444.
- [22] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An introduction to Field Theory*, Perseus Books, Reading 1995.
- [23] CMS Physics Technical Design Report, Vol.1. CERN/LHCC 2006-001.
- [24] M. Pieri et al., CMS Note 2006/112.
- [25] A. Alboteanu, T. Ohl and R. Ruckl, PoS **HEP2005** (2006) 322 [arXiv:hep-ph/0511188]; Phys. Rev. D **74**, 096004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0608155].
- [26] R. Wulkenhaar, JHEP **0203** (2002) 024 [arXiv:hep-th/0112248].
- [27] M. Buric and V. Radovanovic, JHEP **0402** (2004) 040 [arXiv:hep-th/0401103];
- [28] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar, Lett. Math. Phys. **71**, 13 (2005); J. Nonlin. Math. Phys. **11S1**, 9 (2004); Commun. Math. Phys. **256**, 305 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0401128]; H. Grosse and H. Steinacker, Nucl. Phys. B **746**, 202 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0512203]; V. Rivasseau, F. Vignes-Tourneret and R. Wulkenhaar, Commun. Math. Phys. **262**, 565 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0501036]; H. Grosse and M. Wohlgenannt, arXiv:0706.2167 [hep-th].
- [29] L. Möller, JHEP **10** (2004) 063 [arXiv:hep-th/0409085]; A. Alboteanu, T. Ohl and R. Rückl, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 105018, 0707.3595[hep-th]; Josip Trampetić and Michael Wohlgenannt, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 127703 (2007), 0710.2182[hep-th].